

film coated on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and a sheet material disposed between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film.”

None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10-14, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

Independent claim 15 is allowable over the cited art in that claim 15 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “providing a second substrate having first and second surfaces, wherein the first surface is disposed against the first substrate; coating a non-transparent film on a periphery of the second surface of the second substrate...; and disposing a sheet material between the light source and the second substrate, wherein at least a portion of one edge of the sheet material is not directly under the non-transparent film.” None of the cited references including the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 or Suzuki et al., singly or in combination, teaches or suggest at least this feature of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 and claims 16-23, which depend therefrom are allowable over the cited references.

The Examiner cites the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 as disclosing “a first sheet material (10) disposed between the light source (20) and the second substrate (6), and a least a portion of one edge of the sheet material (10) is not directly under the black matrix (26) (as the non-transparent film)...” and that the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 “discloses a black pattern (24) (non-transparent film) is printed on the left edge of the protective sheet (10a) and it is on the lower surface of the second substrate (6). The Examiner then asserts the

related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 "does not expressly disclose a non-transparent film coated on periphery of the second surface (lower surface) of the second substrate." In attempting to cure the deficiencies of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, the Examiner cites Suzuki et al. as disclosing "...a liquid crystal display device having a shield tape (TAPE) is stuck to the lower face of the lower substrate (SUB1)... The shield tape (TAPE) is along the seal member (SL)... such that the shield tape (TAPE) is coated on the periphery of the lower face of the lower substrate." The Examiner then concludes "it would have been obvious to... use a non-transparent black film coated on periphery of the lower surface of the lower substrate..."

To establish *prima facie* obviousness, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the combination of the cited references. Applicant respectfully submits, even if Suzuki et al. were properly combinable with the teachings of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, the Examiner's cited combination would still fail to teach or suggest at least the aforementioned claim limitations. For example, Applicant respectfully submits the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2 shows wherein the black matrix (26) is arranged between an upper glass substrate (4) and a lower glass substrate (6). Further, Applicant respectfully submits, Suzuki et al. does not cure the deficiencies of the related art shown in Figures 1 and 2, with respect to the aforementioned elements of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill to combine the cited references and arrive at the claimed invention with any reasonable expectation of success.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner deem